

From: pearse@biology.ucsc.edu  
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2006 2:32 PM  
To: fgc@fgc.ca.gov  
Cc: Melissa Miller-Henson; John Ugoretz  
Subject: Pacific Grove-Monterey solution

Dear Fish and Game Commissioners

One of the thorniest areas facing everyone trying to craft a network of MPAs on the central coast has been the Monterey Peninsula, specifically that portion off the cities of Pacific Grove and Monterey. Many different users and interests converge there. Trying to accommodate those interests resulted in a lot of conflict both inside and outside the Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group, and resulted in a variety of proposals, all of which broke the limited coastline on the northern side of the Monterey Peninsula into 3 to 5 small MPAs, most with difficult-to-define boundaries.

The city councils of both Pacific Grove and Monterey have devoted time in public meetings to discuss the different packages before you, and the Pacific Grove city council passed resolutions about what they would like to see. Pacific Grove council members, listening to their constituents, voted repeatedly to support a State Marine Reserve off their entire coastline, and oppose dividing it into different MPAs as proposed by all the current packages. The Monterey city council on the other hand, views their coastline more from the perspective of the fishing and business community centered around their harbor; they have not welcomed restrictive MPAs at all.

I propose a simple solution. GIVE EACH CITY WHAT THEY WANT.

That is: Set aside the entire coastline of Pacific Grove, including that off Hopkins Marine Station, as the Pacific Grove SMR. All the stakeholder proposals, as well as the DFG's Package P, have an expanded Hopkins SMR; the value of the current Hopkins SMR is well recognized, but it is also recognized to be too small. The proposed expanded Hopkins SMR in all the packages is still too small to be biologically significant. If the whole coast of Pacific Grove was one single SMR, we would have a biologically significant reserve that would satisfy most citizens of Pacific Grove as well. The boundaries could be those in Package P for the proposed Pacific Grove Marine Gardens SMCA plus the proposed expanded Hopkins SMR. Those boundaries were established to be easily recognized and enforceable. It could be named simply the Pacific Grove State Marine Reserve.

The area off Hopkins Marine Station could continue to be monitored closely by staff of Hopkins Marine Station, while the remainder might be monitored by the city of Pacific Grove, who is so anxious to have a reserve off its coast. Calling it all the Pacific Grove SMR, and abandoning the name Hopkins SMR, should quiet those who believe Stanford University is making a land grab by expanding the Hopkins SMR. I doubt that Hopkins cares at all what the reserve is called.

The only uses in the proposed Pacific Grove Marine Gardens SMCA in Package P are recreational fishing and hand harvest of kelp. However, if the coast off the City of Monterey is open to those activities, unrestricted, they could be accommodated there. The two small commercial abalone companies in Monterey would be assured a supply of kelp year-round off Cannery Row, and boat rental and launches in the Monterey harbor could service recreational fishers, most who do not go beyond the canneries now anyway. Diver training could still occur off San Carlos Beach as now, and once trained, divers could visit the completely protected kelp forests in the PG SMR, either from boats from the Monterey Harbor, or from the shore of Pacific Grove.

Simple: only ONE MPA off the northern coast of the Monterey Peninsula, the Pacific Grove State Marine Reserve. Large enough to be biologically meaningful, satisfying

the wishes of most citizens of Pacific Grove, while allowing the city of Monterey to continue to support fishing and abalone mariculture.

As a member of the Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group, and one of the developers and proponents of Package 3R. I only regret that I had not incorporated this idea into Package 3R earlier. I am sure that all the proponents of Package 3R would join me in support of this proposal.

Respectively,

John Pearse  
183 Ocean View Blvd  
Pacific Grove, CA 93950  
831-648-9245